

WILMINGTON, DE 19805

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/699,333	10/30/2003	Steven A. Mestemacher	AD6927USNA	AD6927USNA 2534	
23906	7590 02/07/2006		EXAM	INER	
E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY			HOOK, J	HOOK, JAMES F	
LEGAL PATE	ENT RECORDS CENTER			<u> </u>	
BARLEY MII	LL PLAZA 25/1128		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
4417 LANCA	STER PIKE		3754		

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/699,333 MESTEMACHER, STEVEN			
Examiner	Art Unit		
James F. Hook	3754		

	James F. Hook	3754	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence ado	ress
THE REPLY FILED 19 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aft tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the contract of the	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (a) 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 76 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	06.07(f).		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of the appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in befappeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		impliant Amendment	(1 102 024).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		II be entered and an o	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:		,	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	it before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s) Ames F. Hook Primary Examiner	<u>-</u>
		Art Unit: 3754	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the argument directed toward Subramanian is not persuasive because applicant acknowledges that Subramanian recites making tubing from the material, and further sets forth that the term "pipe" as defined in the instant applications specification as a cylindrical conduit as set forth on page 4 of the specification. The term tube is known in the art and as per the definition in Webster's Collegiate 10th edition dictionary is also a cylindrical conduit and relates such to fluid flow as well, and therefore it is considered that tubing meets the pipe definition of applicant's claim. With respect to any ties to a specific use, such is merely intended use to use such for specific materials to be carried therein, and therefore such is not placing any more limitation on the claim other than intended use where the material is made in tubular form and is capable of use with the same materials as applicant in that the materials are the same and inherently would have the same properties. Therefore, the request for reconsideration is not persuasive.